

Materials Review Request Form — Proposed Revisions

Rationale for Update

Revision of the Materials Review Request Form is recommended so that the form accurately reflects the procedures and standards established in the revised Collection Development Policy. Although the form was substantially updated in 2024, review of the two documents together identified several procedural differences and areas where the form could be simplified, clarified, and better aligned with the proposed policy.

Detailed Changes

1. Alignment With the Revised Collection Development Policy

The form has been revised so that procedural requirements do not conflict with or operate independently from the Board-approved policy.

Eligibility, filing limits, informal consultation, repeat reviews, review procedure, decision timelines, and Board appeal are now stated consistently in both documents.

2. Retained Eligibility Requirements

The proposed form retains the principal eligibility standard adopted in 2024: a formal request may be submitted by an adult Baker County resident who is a registered BCLD cardholder.

The form clearly identifies these requirements at the beginning of the process so requesters can determine eligibility before completing the full form.

3. Simplified Informal Consultation Requirement

The 2024 form required the requester to document a prior discussion and written response from the Library Director.

The proposed revision simplifies this requirement. A requester must first discuss the concern with the Library Director or designee and allow an opportunity for informal resolution, but the requester is not required to create or attach separate documentation of that discussion.

This avoids unnecessary paperwork and prevents the process from appearing to require two separate formal Director decisions.

4. Clarified Filing Limits

The form retains the limitation of one formal request per person within a 30-day period and expressly ties that limitation to the Collection Development Policy.

The form also reflects the three-year repeat-review provision while recognizing the limited exceptions permitted under the policy for materially changed circumstances.

5. Removal of Discretionary Fee Provision

The 2024 form stated that a fee might be imposed after more than three requests within twelve months but did not establish an amount, calculation method, waiver standard, or separately adopted fee schedule.

The proposed form removes that provision.

The one-request-per-30-days limit remains available as the principal mechanism for ensuring that repeated requests can be processed without unreasonably disrupting Library operations.

6. Broader Description of Materials Subject to Review

The form is revised so it can be used for contemporary library collections rather than only conventional books and media.

Fields use broader terminology such as “title or name of resource” and “author, creator, producer, or provider, if applicable.”

Format options are expanded to accommodate digital resources, databases, streaming services, games, equipment, Library of Things materials, and other resources covered by the Collection Development Policy.

7. More Focused Questions

The revised form concentrates on information directly relevant to applying the Collection Development Policy.

Questions ask the requester to identify the specific resource, describe the concern, explain what portions of the work have been reviewed, identify the requested action, and provide any additional information or alternative resources the requester believes should be considered.

Several questions from the 2024 form that required the requester to respond to broader philosophical statements about intellectual freedom, parental authority, or the rights of other readers have been removed.

Those principles are more appropriately established by Board policy and applied by reviewers than presented as propositions a requester must affirm or reject.

8. Evaluation of the Work as a Whole

The revised form reinforces the policy standard that a resource will be reviewed in its complete context rather than solely on selected passages or excerpts.

The form asks the requester to indicate how much of the material has been read, viewed, listened to, or otherwise examined, while not requiring complete consumption of a resource as a prerequisite to filing a concern.

9. Clear Requested-Action Field

The revised form makes the requested outcome explicit.

This helps distinguish between concerns about retention, placement, cataloging, audience designation, access, accuracy, or another specific issue and gives reviewers a clearer understanding of the remedy being requested.

10. Updated Public Records and Privacy Notice

The 2024 form contained differing statements about possible disclosure of the requester's identity.

The revised form uses a single notice consistent with BCLD's Privacy and Confidentiality Policy and Oregon public-records requirements.

It explains that a submitted review request may constitute a public record and that information will be handled and disclosed in accordance with applicable law and District policy.

11. Removal of Premature Hearing Election

The 2024 form asked the requester at the initial filing stage to indicate whether the requester would testify at a hearing.

The proposed revision removes that question.

Any Board appeal or opportunity for public comment occurs only after the administrative review and Director's decision, so hearing procedures are more appropriately addressed if and when an appeal is filed.

12. Clearer Explanation of the Review and Appeal Process

The revised form provides a concise description of what happens after submission:

1. staff confirm that the request is complete and eligible;
2. the material is reviewed under the Collection Development Policy;
3. the material ordinarily remains available during review;
4. the Library Director issues a written decision; and
5. the requester may submit a written appeal to the Board within 10 business days if the requester believes the policy or review procedure was not properly applied.

This makes the form both an application document and a practical explanation of the process without requiring patrons to reconcile several different District policies.